

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The amendments set forth above and the following remarks are responsive to the points raised by the Office Action dated November 24, 2009. In view of the amendments set forth above and the following remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Pending Claims

Claims 1-12 remain pending. Claims 1 and 9 are amended to describe the invention more clearly. No new matter is added, and support for the amended claim language may be found within the specification, claims, and drawings. Support for claims 1 and 9 may be found in the specification at, e.g., page 4, lines 19-20; page 6, line 26 to page 7, line 5; page 7, line 9 to page 8, line 14; and Figure 3.

Amendment to the Specification

The specification is amended at page 7, line 25 to correct an informality. No new matter is added.

The Office Action

Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0155479 to Kishi et al. (hereinafter, "Kishi") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,946,988 to Edwards et al. (hereinafter, "Edwards").

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The obviousness rejection cannot be maintained because the cited combination of references, Kishi and Edwards, fails to teach or suggest each and every element of amended independent claims 1 and 9.

Amended independent claims 1 and 9 each recite a control panel having a bottom part "detachably hinged" to that of the chassis front side "such that the control panel is removeable from the chassis."

However, neither Kishi nor Edwards teaches or suggests a control panel that is “detachably hinged” to the chassis front side “such that the control panel is removeable from the chassis,” as claimed in amended independent claims 1 and 9. The panel 3 of Kishi is not removeable from the main body 2. Edwards teaches a removeable remote controller for an electronic entertainment device (col. 2, lines 60-62). However, the remote controller of Edwards is not “hinged,” as recited in amended claims 1 and 9. Moreover, the Office Action does not explain why a control panel that is “detachably hinged” to the chassis front side “such that the control panel is removeable from the chassis” would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. In order for an obviousness rejection to be maintained, the Office Action must provide an appropriate supporting rationale for the proposed modification (*KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.* (*KSR*), 550 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007); (MPEP § 2141). The Office Action has failed to do this. Accordingly, the obviousness rejection of amended claims 1 and 9 cannot be maintained.

Amended claims 1 and 9 also recite that a wireless link is provided by “a single pair of transmitter and receiver.” In other words, the claimed equipment uses a single transmitter and receiver for both the attached and removed conditions of the claimed equipment. The use of a single transmitter and receiver, as claimed, has numerous advantages, including greater simplicity and a reduction in the number of components used in the device. In addition, as explained in the specification, the wireless link provided by the *single* pair of transmitter (410/410’) and receiver (420/420’) advantageously enables the *same* communication channel to be used between the control panel (200) and the playing mechanism (300) so that the communication channel does not need to be changed or switched when the panel (200) is attached to or removed from the chassis (100). Furthermore, no electrical contact is required (specification, e.g., page 7, line 19 to page 8, line 3).

On the contrary, the combination of Kishi and Edwards fails to teach or suggest a “single pair of transmitter and receiver,” as claimed in amended claims 1 and 9. The Office Action correctly acknowledges that Kishi fails to teach the claimed wireless link. Contrary to the claimed “single pair of transmitter and receiver,” Edwards describes a device including a first infrared transmitter and a second infrared transmitter (Edwards, Abstract, col. 1, line 56 to col. 2, line 4; col. 3, lines 42-46; col. 4, lines 24-39; col. 5, lines 29-45). Edwards claim 1 requires first and second infrared transmitters for use when the remote controller is docked


and not docked, respectively. Claim 9 of Edwards requires the use of metal contacts when the remote controller is docked and an infrared transmitter when the remote controller is not docked. Claim 12 of Edwards requires a first infrared transmitter for use when the remote controller is docked, and claim 13 of Edwards adds a second infrared transmitter for use in the detached condition. Accordingly, unlike the claimed device, the device of Edwards does not use the same communication channel in the attached and removed conditions. Because the combination of Kishi and Edwards fails to teach or suggest a "single pair of transmitter and receiver," as claimed in amended claims 1 and 9, and because the Office Action fails to explain why a single pair of transmitter and receiver would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, the obviousness rejection of amended claims 1 and 9 cannot be maintained.

Independent claims 1 and 9 are patentable for the reasons set forth above. The dependent claims are also patentable because they depend from and include the limitations of independent claims 1 and 9.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,


Stephanie M. Lawley, Reg. No. 55362
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-3960
(202) 737-6770 (telephone)
(202) 737-6776 (facsimile)

Date: Feb 16, 2010

Amendment or ROA - Regular (SML/mlg)